

1  
2 The Honorable Marsha J. Pechman  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
11 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
12 AT SEATTLE

13 CLAUDE A. REESE, Individually and ) No. 08-1008 MJP  
14 on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated, )  
15 v. Plaintiff, ) **DEFENDANT BPXA'S MOTION FOR**  
16 JOHN BROWNE and ROBERT A. MALONE, ) **INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL**  
17 Defendants. ) **PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1292(B).**

18 John L. Warden  
19 Richard C. Pepperman, II  
20 Steven J. Purcell  
21 Diane L. McGimsey  
22 Gerald L. Black, Jr.  
23 Elizabeth K. Ehrlich  
24 (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)  
25 SULLIVAN & CROMWELL LLP  
26 125 Broad Street  
27 New York, New York 10004  
(212) 558-4000 (tel.)  
(212) 558-3588 (fax)

26 David C. Lundsgaard, WSBA #25448  
27 GRAHAM & DUNN PC  
PIER 70  
2801 Alaskan Way, Suite 300  
Seattle, Washington 98121  
(206) 340-9691 (tel.)  
(206) 340-9599 (fax)

29 *Attorneys for Defendants*

30 DEFENDANT BPXA'S MOTION  
31 FOR INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL  
32 PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1292(B)

33 **GRAHAM & DUNN PC**  
34 PIER 70, 2801 ALASKAN WAY ~ SUITE 300  
35 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98121-1128  
36 (206) 624-8300/Fax: (206) 340-9599

1           Defendant BP Exploration (Alaska) Inc. (“BPXA”) respectfully moves for certification of  
 2 the Court’s Order on Motion to Dismiss dated February 27, 2009 for interlocutory appeal  
 3 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b).

4           **I. INTRODUCTION**

5           On February 27, 2009, this Court granted in part and denied in part Defendants’ motion  
 6 to dismiss, allowing Plaintiffs’ claim under § 10(b) to proceed against BPXA and their § 20(a)  
 7 “control person” claim to proceed against BP p.l.c., John Browne, Steve Marshall and Maureen  
 8 L. Johnson. The Court’s Order presents two important controlling questions of law that are  
 9 issues of first impression in the Ninth Circuit, either of which is potentially dispositive of this  
 10 case:

11           1.       Whether a third party’s inclusion of a contract as an attachment to its SEC filings,  
 12 without more, is tantamount to a representation by a counterparty to the contract  
 13 that it is in compliance with the contract.  
 14           2.       Whether a party’s admission to negligence as part of a misdemeanor guilty plea,  
 15 without more, is sufficient to establish the requisite strong inference of scienter.

16           In upholding Plaintiffs’ § 10(b) claim against BPXA, the Court held that Plaintiffs have  
 17 adequately alleged only one actionable misrepresentation or omission. The Court concluded that  
 18 the attachment of a contract called the Overriding Royalty Conveyance to the periodic SEC  
 19 filings of the BP Prudhoe Bay Royalty Trust (the “Trust”) constituted an ongoing representation  
 20 by BPXA that it was complying with its obligation under that contract to operate Prudhoe Bay  
 21 according to a “Prudent Operator Standard.” In accepting Plaintiffs’ assertion that the  
 22 attachment of this contract to the Trust’s SEC filings constituted a representation by BPXA to  
 23 BP p.l.c. shareholders, the Court may have overlooked certain facts:

24           •       The SEC filings in question are those of the Trust, not BPXA. The Bank of New York as  
 25 Trustee, not BPXA, prepares the Trust’s SEC filings. The Trust attached the contract to  
 26 its SEC filings pursuant to an SEC regulation requiring that instruments defining the

27           DEFENDANT BPXA’S MOTION  
 FOR INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL  
 PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1292(B) -- 1

**GRAHAM & DUNN** PC  
 PIER 70, 2801 ALASKAN WAY ~ SUITE 300  
 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98121-1128  
 (206) 624-8300/Fax: (206) 340-9599

1 rights of the issuer's security holders be filed as exhibits. The security holders in  
 2 question are the Trust's unit holders.

3

- 4 The Trust's SEC filings are not a statement by anyone to BP p.l.c shareholders about  
 5 their rights or BP p.l.c.'s business. BP p.l.c. makes its own SEC filings and is required to  
 6 attach as exhibits to those filings both its material contracts and instruments defining its  
 7 shareholders' rights. BP p.l.c. never filed the Overriding Royalty Conveyance as an  
 8 exhibit pursuant to either requirement because the contract is not material to BP p.l.c.'s  
 9 business and does not have any bearing on the rights of BP p.l.c.'s shareholders.
- 10
- 11 The attachment of the Overriding Royalty Conveyance, a contract executed in 1989, to  
 12 the Trust's SEC filings is not a statement by anyone that BPXA has fully performed all of  
 13 its obligations under that contract over the succeeding two decades. It is simply a  
 14 statement of what those obligations are. As with any contract, a breach may occur, and if  
 15 it does, appropriate remedies may be sought in law and equity if necessary. Here, the  
 16 Trustee has asserted a claim of breach against BPXA, and a settlement in principle has  
 17 been reached and is now being documented.

18 Given that the contract at issue was filed by a third party, not BPXA, the Court's Order  
 19 potentially has far-reaching consequences. In fact, the practical effect of the Court's ruling is to  
 20 impose an ongoing obligation on BP p.l.c. to police the public filings of the counterparty to each  
 21 of its hundreds, if not thousands, of contracts because the public filing of such a contract could  
 22 be considered an ongoing representation of compliance by BP p.l.c. or one of its affiliates that  
 23 would transform any breach of contract claim into an action for federal securities fraud.

24 The Court also held that Plaintiffs have adequately alleged that BPXA acted with  
 25 scienter, based entirely on BPXA's agreement to plead guilty to a single misdemeanor violation  
 26 of the Clean Water Act. That Plea Agreement, however, was predicated on a mental state of  
 27 negligence. Indeed, the Plea Agreement expressly states that "BPXA acted *negligently* by failing  
 to adequately inspect and clean" the Prudhoe Bay oil transit lines ("OTLs"). (Plea Agreement at  
 8 (emphasis added).) No controlling authority of which we are aware has held that a guilty plea  
 based on negligent conduct is sufficient to establish scienter for purposes of § 10(b) liability.  
 The law in the Ninth Circuit is clear that "[n]egligence, even gross negligence, does not rise to

28  
 29  
 30  
 31  
 32  
 33  
 34  
 35  
 36  
 37  
 38  
 39  
 40  
 41  
 42  
 43  
 44  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51  
 52  
 53  
 54  
 55  
 56  
 57  
 58  
 59  
 60  
 61  
 62  
 63  
 64  
 65  
 66  
 67  
 68  
 69  
 70  
 71  
 72  
 73  
 74  
 75  
 76  
 77  
 78  
 79  
 80  
 81  
 82  
 83  
 84  
 85  
 86  
 87  
 88  
 89  
 90  
 91  
 92  
 93  
 94  
 95  
 96  
 97  
 98  
 99  
 100  
 101  
 102  
 103  
 104  
 105  
 106  
 107  
 108  
 109  
 110  
 111  
 112  
 113  
 114  
 115  
 116  
 117  
 118  
 119  
 120  
 121  
 122  
 123  
 124  
 125  
 126  
 127  
 128  
 129  
 130  
 131  
 132  
 133  
 134  
 135  
 136  
 137  
 138  
 139  
 140  
 141  
 142  
 143  
 144  
 145  
 146  
 147  
 148  
 149  
 150  
 151  
 152  
 153  
 154  
 155  
 156  
 157  
 158  
 159  
 160  
 161  
 162  
 163  
 164  
 165  
 166  
 167  
 168  
 169  
 170  
 171  
 172  
 173  
 174  
 175  
 176  
 177  
 178  
 179  
 180  
 181  
 182  
 183  
 184  
 185  
 186  
 187  
 188  
 189  
 190  
 191  
 192  
 193  
 194  
 195  
 196  
 197  
 198  
 199  
 200  
 201  
 202  
 203  
 204  
 205  
 206  
 207  
 208  
 209  
 210  
 211  
 212  
 213  
 214  
 215  
 216  
 217  
 218  
 219  
 220  
 221  
 222  
 223  
 224  
 225  
 226  
 227  
 228  
 229  
 230  
 231  
 232  
 233  
 234  
 235  
 236  
 237  
 238  
 239  
 240  
 241  
 242  
 243  
 244  
 245  
 246  
 247  
 248  
 249  
 250  
 251  
 252  
 253  
 254  
 255  
 256  
 257  
 258  
 259  
 260  
 261  
 262  
 263  
 264  
 265  
 266  
 267  
 268  
 269  
 270  
 271  
 272  
 273  
 274  
 275  
 276  
 277  
 278  
 279  
 280  
 281  
 282  
 283  
 284  
 285  
 286  
 287  
 288  
 289  
 290  
 291  
 292  
 293  
 294  
 295  
 296  
 297  
 298  
 299  
 300  
 301  
 302  
 303  
 304  
 305  
 306  
 307  
 308  
 309  
 310  
 311  
 312  
 313  
 314  
 315  
 316  
 317  
 318  
 319  
 320  
 321  
 322  
 323  
 324  
 325  
 326  
 327  
 328  
 329  
 330  
 331  
 332  
 333  
 334  
 335  
 336  
 337  
 338  
 339  
 340  
 341  
 342  
 343  
 344  
 345  
 346  
 347  
 348  
 349  
 350  
 351  
 352  
 353  
 354  
 355  
 356  
 357  
 358  
 359  
 360  
 361  
 362  
 363  
 364  
 365  
 366  
 367  
 368  
 369  
 370  
 371  
 372  
 373  
 374  
 375  
 376  
 377  
 378  
 379  
 380  
 381  
 382  
 383  
 384  
 385  
 386  
 387  
 388  
 389  
 390  
 391  
 392  
 393  
 394  
 395  
 396  
 397  
 398  
 399  
 400  
 401  
 402  
 403  
 404  
 405  
 406  
 407  
 408  
 409  
 410  
 411  
 412  
 413  
 414  
 415  
 416  
 417  
 418  
 419  
 420  
 421  
 422  
 423  
 424  
 425  
 426  
 427  
 428  
 429  
 430  
 431  
 432  
 433  
 434  
 435  
 436  
 437  
 438  
 439  
 440  
 441  
 442  
 443  
 444  
 445  
 446  
 447  
 448  
 449  
 450  
 451  
 452  
 453  
 454  
 455  
 456  
 457  
 458  
 459  
 460  
 461  
 462  
 463  
 464  
 465  
 466  
 467  
 468  
 469  
 470  
 471  
 472  
 473  
 474  
 475  
 476  
 477  
 478  
 479  
 480  
 481  
 482  
 483  
 484  
 485  
 486  
 487  
 488  
 489  
 490  
 491  
 492  
 493  
 494  
 495  
 496  
 497  
 498  
 499  
 500  
 501  
 502  
 503  
 504  
 505  
 506  
 507  
 508  
 509  
 510  
 511  
 512  
 513  
 514  
 515  
 516  
 517  
 518  
 519  
 520  
 521  
 522  
 523  
 524  
 525  
 526  
 527  
 528  
 529  
 530  
 531  
 532  
 533  
 534  
 535  
 536  
 537  
 538  
 539  
 540  
 541  
 542  
 543  
 544  
 545  
 546  
 547  
 548  
 549  
 550  
 551  
 552  
 553  
 554  
 555  
 556  
 557  
 558  
 559  
 560  
 561  
 562  
 563  
 564  
 565  
 566  
 567  
 568  
 569  
 570  
 571  
 572  
 573  
 574  
 575  
 576  
 577  
 578  
 579  
 580  
 581  
 582  
 583  
 584  
 585  
 586  
 587  
 588  
 589  
 590  
 591  
 592  
 593  
 594  
 595  
 596  
 597  
 598  
 599  
 600  
 601  
 602  
 603  
 604  
 605  
 606  
 607  
 608  
 609  
 610  
 611  
 612  
 613  
 614  
 615  
 616  
 617  
 618  
 619  
 620  
 621  
 622  
 623  
 624  
 625  
 626  
 627  
 628  
 629  
 630  
 631  
 632  
 633  
 634  
 635  
 636  
 637  
 638  
 639  
 640  
 641  
 642  
 643  
 644  
 645  
 646  
 647  
 648  
 649  
 650  
 651  
 652  
 653  
 654  
 655  
 656  
 657  
 658  
 659  
 660  
 661  
 662  
 663  
 664  
 665  
 666  
 667  
 668  
 669  
 670  
 671  
 672  
 673  
 674  
 675  
 676  
 677  
 678  
 679  
 680  
 681  
 682  
 683  
 684  
 685  
 686  
 687  
 688  
 689  
 690  
 691  
 692  
 693  
 694  
 695  
 696  
 697  
 698  
 699  
 700  
 701  
 702  
 703  
 704  
 705  
 706  
 707  
 708  
 709  
 710  
 711  
 712  
 713  
 714  
 715  
 716  
 717  
 718  
 719  
 720  
 721  
 722  
 723  
 724  
 725  
 726  
 727  
 728  
 729  
 730  
 731  
 732  
 733  
 734  
 735  
 736  
 737  
 738  
 739  
 740  
 741  
 742  
 743  
 744  
 745  
 746  
 747  
 748  
 749  
 750  
 751  
 752  
 753  
 754  
 755  
 756  
 757  
 758  
 759  
 760  
 761  
 762  
 763  
 764  
 765  
 766  
 767  
 768  
 769  
 770  
 771  
 772  
 773  
 774  
 775  
 776  
 777  
 778  
 779  
 780  
 781  
 782  
 783  
 784  
 785  
 786  
 787  
 788  
 789  
 790  
 791  
 792  
 793  
 794  
 795  
 796  
 797  
 798  
 799  
 800  
 801  
 802  
 803  
 804  
 805  
 806  
 807  
 808  
 809  
 810  
 811  
 812  
 813  
 814  
 815  
 816  
 817  
 818  
 819  
 820  
 821  
 822  
 823  
 824  
 825  
 826  
 827  
 828  
 829  
 830  
 831  
 832  
 833  
 834  
 835  
 836  
 837  
 838  
 839  
 840  
 841  
 842  
 843  
 844  
 845  
 846  
 847  
 848  
 849  
 850  
 851  
 852  
 853  
 854  
 855  
 856  
 857  
 858  
 859  
 860  
 861  
 862  
 863  
 864  
 865  
 866  
 867  
 868  
 869  
 870  
 871  
 872  
 873  
 874  
 875  
 876  
 877  
 878  
 879  
 880  
 881  
 882  
 883  
 884  
 885  
 886  
 887  
 888  
 889  
 890  
 891  
 892  
 893  
 894  
 895  
 896  
 897  
 898  
 899  
 900  
 901  
 902  
 903  
 904  
 905  
 906  
 907  
 908  
 909  
 910  
 911  
 912  
 913  
 914  
 915  
 916  
 917  
 918  
 919  
 920  
 921  
 922  
 923  
 924  
 925  
 926  
 927  
 928  
 929  
 930  
 931  
 932  
 933  
 934  
 935  
 936  
 937  
 938  
 939  
 940  
 941  
 942  
 943  
 944  
 945  
 946  
 947  
 948  
 949  
 950  
 951  
 952  
 953  
 954  
 955  
 956  
 957  
 958  
 959  
 960  
 961  
 962  
 963  
 964  
 965  
 966  
 967  
 968  
 969  
 970  
 971  
 972  
 973  
 974  
 975  
 976  
 977  
 978  
 979  
 980  
 981  
 982  
 983  
 984  
 985  
 986  
 987  
 988  
 989  
 990  
 991  
 992  
 993  
 994  
 995  
 996  
 997  
 998  
 999  
 1000  
 1001  
 1002  
 1003  
 1004  
 1005  
 1006  
 1007  
 1008  
 1009  
 1010  
 1011  
 1012  
 1013  
 1014  
 1015  
 1016  
 1017  
 1018  
 1019  
 1020  
 1021  
 1022  
 1023  
 1024  
 1025  
 1026  
 1027  
 1028  
 1029  
 1030  
 1031  
 1032  
 1033  
 1034  
 1035  
 1036  
 1037  
 1038  
 1039  
 1040  
 1041  
 1042  
 1043  
 1044  
 1045  
 1046  
 1047  
 1048  
 1049  
 1050  
 1051  
 1052  
 1053  
 1054  
 1055  
 1056  
 1057  
 1058  
 1059  
 1060  
 1061  
 1062  
 1063  
 1064  
 1065  
 1066  
 1067  
 1068  
 1069  
 1070  
 1071  
 1072  
 1073  
 1074  
 1075  
 1076  
 1077  
 1078  
 1079  
 1080  
 1081  
 1082  
 1083  
 1084  
 1085  
 1086  
 1087  
 1088  
 1089  
 1090  
 1091  
 1092  
 1093  
 1094  
 1095  
 1096  
 1097  
 1098  
 1099  
 1100  
 1101  
 1102  
 1103  
 1104  
 1105  
 1106  
 1107  
 1108  
 1109  
 1110  
 1111  
 1112  
 1113  
 1114  
 1115  
 1116  
 1117  
 1118  
 1119  
 1120  
 1121  
 1122  
 1123  
 1124  
 1125  
 1126  
 1127  
 1128  
 1129  
 1130  
 1131  
 1132  
 1133  
 1134  
 1135  
 1136  
 1137  
 1138  
 1139  
 1140  
 1141  
 1142  
 1143  
 1144  
 1145  
 1146  
 1147  
 1148  
 1149  
 1150  
 1151  
 1152  
 1153  
 1154  
 1155  
 1156  
 1157  
 1158  
 1159  
 1160  
 1161  
 1162  
 1163  
 1164  
 1165  
 1166  
 1167  
 1168  
 1169  
 1170  
 1171  
 1172  
 1173  
 1174  
 1175  
 1176  
 1177  
 1178  
 1179  
 1180  
 1181  
 1182  
 1183  
 1184  
 1185  
 1186  
 1187  
 1188  
 1189  
 1190  
 1191  
 1192  
 1193  
 1194  
 1195  
 1196  
 1197  
 1198  
 1199  
 1200  
 1201  
 1202  
 1203  
 1204  
 1205  
 1206  
 1207  
 1208  
 1209  
 1210  
 1211  
 1212  
 1213  
 1214  
 1215  
 1216  
 1217  
 1218  
 1219  
 1220  
 1221  
 1222  
 1223  
 1224  
 1225  
 1226  
 1227  
 1228  
 1229  
 1230  
 1231  
 1232  
 1233  
 1234  
 1235  
 1236  
 1237  
 1238  
 1239  
 12310  
 12311  
 12312  
 12313  
 12314  
 12315  
 12316  
 12317  
 12318  
 12319  
 12320  
 12321  
 12322  
 12323  
 12324  
 12325  
 12326  
 12327  
 12328  
 12329  
 12330  
 12331  
 12332  
 12333  
 12334  
 12335  
 12336  
 12337  
 12338  
 12339  
 12340  
 12341  
 12342  
 12343  
 12344  
 12345  
 12346  
 12347  
 12348  
 12349  
 12350  
 12351  
 12352  
 12353  
 12354  
 12355  
 12356  
 12357  
 12358  
 12359  
 12360  
 12361  
 12362  
 12363  
 12364  
 12365  
 12366  
 12367  
 12368  
 12369  
 12370  
 12371  
 12372  
 12373  
 12374  
 12375  
 12376  
 12377  
 12378  
 12379  
 12380  
 12381  
 12382  
 12383  
 12384  
 12385  
 12386  
 12387  
 12388  
 12389  
 12390  
 12391  
 12392  
 12393  
 12394  
 12395  
 12396  
 12397  
 12398  
 12399  
 123100  
 123101  
 123102  
 123103  
 123104  
 123105  
 123106  
 123107  
 123108  
 123109  
 123110  
 123111  
 123112  
 123113  
 123114  
 123115  
 123116  
 123117  
 123118  
 123119  
 123120  
 123121  
 123122  
 123123  
 123124  
 123125  
 123126  
 123127  
 123128  
 123129  
 123130  
 123131  
 123132  
 123133  
 123134  
 123135  
 123136  
 123137  
 123138  
 123139  
 123140  
 123141  
 123142  
 123143  
 123144  
 123145  
 123146  
 123147  
 123148  
 123149  
 123150  
 123151  
 123152  
 123153  
 123154  
 123155  
 123156  
 123157  
 123158  
 123159  
 123160  
 123161  
 123162  
 123163  
 123164  
 123165  
 123166  
 123167  
 123168  
 123169  
 123170  
 123171  
 123172  
 123173  
 123174  
 123175  
 123176  
 123177  
 123178  
 123179  
 123180  
 123181  
 123182  
 123183  
 123184  
 123185  
 123186  
 123187  
 123188  
 123189  
 123190  
 123191  
 123192  
 123193  
 123194  
 123195  
 123196  
 123197  
 123198  
 123199  
 12

1 the level of the nefarious mental state necessary to constitute securities fraud under the PSLRA.”  
 2 *DSAM Global Value Fund v. Altris Software, Inc.*, 288 F.3d 385, 391 (9th Cir. 2002). In holding  
 3 otherwise, the Order relied entirely on excerpts from two paragraphs of the Plea Agreement  
 4 where BPXA admitted that it was aware of sediment buildup in the OTLs and that it knew that it  
 5 had insufficient inspection data. (Order at 12-13.) The Order, however, does not consider other  
 6 statements in the Plea Agreement that establish that BPXA acted only negligently. Moreover,  
 7 the Order does not provide any justification for departing from the Ninth Circuit’s strict  
 8 requirements for pleading scienter, which preclude an inference of scienter based on negligent  
 9 conduct.

10       In the event the Court declines to grant BPXA’s Motion for Reconsideration, filed  
 11 concurrently herewith, or agrees to reconsider its Order but ultimately declines to dismiss  
 12 Plaintiffs’ claims, BPXA requests that the Court certify its Order for interlocutory appeal  
 13 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b). These issues are controlling questions of law on which there is  
 14 no direct legal authority, and immediate appellate review would both accelerate the potential  
 15 resolution of this case and provide guidance on important issues that have yet to be directly  
 16 addressed by the Ninth Circuit or, for that matter, any other court.

17 **II. ARGUMENT**

18       BPXA requests that the Court certify the following questions for interlocutory appeal  
 19 pursuant to § 1292(b):

20       1.      Whether a third party’s inclusion of a contract as an attachment to its SEC filings,  
 21 without more, is tantamount to a representation by a counterparty to the contract  
 22 that it is in compliance with the contract.  
 23       2.      Whether a party’s admission to negligence as part of a misdemeanor guilty plea,  
 24 without more, is sufficient to establish the requisite strong inference of scienter.

25  
 26 DEFENDANT BPXA’S MOTION  
 27 FOR INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL  
 PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1292(B) -- 3

**GRAHAM & DUNN PC**  
 PIER 70, 2801 ALASKAN WAY ~ SUITE 300  
 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98121-1128  
 (206) 624-8300/Fax: (206) 340-9599

1 A district court may certify an order for interlocutory appeal if it (1) “involves a  
 2 controlling question of law,” (2) “as to which there is substantial ground for difference of  
 3 opinion,” and (3) “an immediate appeal from the order may materially advance the ultimate  
 4 termination of the litigation.” 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b). The party requesting certification has the  
 5 burden of showing that “exceptional circumstances justify a departure from the basic policy of  
 6 postponing appellate review until after the entry of a final judgment.” *In re Cement Antitrust*  
 7 *Litig.*, 673 F.2d 1020, 1026 (9th Cir. 1982) (quoting *Coopers & Lybrand v. Livesay*, 437 U.S.  
 8 463, 475 (1978)), *aff’d*, 459 U.S. 1190 (1983). Such exceptional circumstances are present  
 9 where allowing an immediate appeal would avoid protracted and expensive litigation. *Id.* at  
 10 1026; *United States Rubber Co. v. Wright*, 359 F.2d 784, 795 (9th Cir. 1966). Once “the  
 11 statutory criteria are met,” there is a “duty of the district court and of [the Court of Appeals] to  
 12 allow an immediate appeal to be taken.” *Ahrenholz v. Bd. of Trs. of the Univ. of Ill.*, 219 F.3d  
 13 674, 677 (7th Cir. 2000). The two questions posed above easily satisfy the predicates for  
 14 certifying the Order for interlocutory appeal under § 1292(b).

15       **A. BPXA Has Proposed Controlling Questions of Law for Certification.**

16       Both questions are pure issues of law that are controlling in this case. An issue is  
 17 “controlling” if “resolution of the issue on appeal could materially affect the outcome of  
 18 litigation in the district court” and is not “collateral to the basic issues” in the dispute. *In re*  
 19 *Cement Antitrust Litig.*, 673 F.2d at 1026-27. Although an issue need not be dispositive of the  
 20 lawsuit to be controlling, *United States v. Woodbury*, 263 F.2d 784, 787-88 (9th Cir. 1959), a  
 21 question of law is clearly “controlling” if reversal of the district court’s order would terminate  
 22 the action.” *Klinghoffer v. S.N.C. Achille Lauro*, 921 F.2d 21, 24 (2d Cir. 1990).

23       Here, a ruling in BPXA’s favor on either question—whether Plaintiffs have adequately  
 24 alleged an actionable misrepresentation by BPXA or whether they have adequately alleged  
 25

26 DEFENDANT BPXA’S MOTION  
 27 FOR INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL  
 PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1292(B) -- 4

**GRAHAM & DUNN PC**  
 PIER 70, 2801 ALASKAN WAY ~ SUITE 300  
 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98121-1128  
 (206) 624-8300/Fax: (206) 340-9599

1 scienter—would terminate the litigation. The Court based its ruling that Plaintiffs have  
 2 adequately alleged a misrepresentation by BPXA entirely on the fact that BNY attached a copy  
 3 of the Overriding Royalty Conveyance to the Trust’s quarterly SEC filings. (*See* Order at 7-12.)  
 4 If that ruling is wrong as a matter of law, then the case is over. Likewise, BPXA’s guilty plea  
 5 served as the only basis for the Court’s ruling that Plaintiffs have adequately alleged that BPXA  
 6 acted with scienter. (*See* Order at 12-13.) If, as a matter of law, a guilty plea predicated entirely  
 7 on negligence is insufficient to allege scienter in the Ninth Circuit, then Plaintiff cannot state a  
 8 § 10(b) claim against BPXA, and the case is over.<sup>1</sup>

9                   **B. There Are Substantial Grounds for a Difference of Opinion.**

10                  The absence of controlling authority can constitute a “substantial ground for a difference  
 11 of opinion.” *Gerds v. Smithkline Beecham Corp.*, No. 04-3500, 2005 WL 1827865, at \*3 (D.  
 12 Minn. July 29, 2005). Here, the Court decided each of these questions without the benefit of any  
 13 Ninth Circuit or other federal authority directly on point. Given the significance of these two  
 14 questions—and the stakes in this litigation—the Court should avail itself of this opportunity to  
 15 solicit the Ninth Circuit’s views before allowing the case to proceed any further.

16                  **1. The Trust’s filing of the contract with the SEC is not a representation  
                           by any party that BPXA is complying with the contract.**

17                  Plaintiffs allege that the Trust’s attachment to its SEC filings of a 1989 contract between  
 18 The Standard Oil Company (“Standard Oil”) and BPXA, whereby BPXA agreed, among many  
 19 other things, to operate Prudhoe Bay according to a so-called “Prudent Operator Standard,”  
 20 constituted an ongoing representation *by BPXA* that it was in fact complying with that standard.  
 21 (Compl. ¶¶ 134-136.) The Court agreed, holding that “the filing of the agreement as a public  
 22

---

23                  <sup>1</sup> If BPXA prevails on either question presented, the remaining § 20(a) “control person” claims against  
 24 BP p.l.c, John Browne, Maureen Johnson and Steve Marshall also would fail because they are  
 25 predicated on an underlying violation of § 10(b) by BPXA.

1 document in compliance with SEC requirements renders it a representation that investors may  
 2 rightly rely on.” (Order at 7.) But the Court’s Order does not address why the *Trust’s* decision  
 3 to attach a copy of the Overriding Royalty Conveyance to the *Trust’s* SEC filings can be imputed  
 4 to BPXA. The Order simply states that that “[t]he Court finds that the quarterly filings with the  
 5 Securities and Exchange Commission (‘SEC’) made in connection with BPXA’s obligations  
 6 under the PBRT contract throughout the purported Class Period (which included documents  
 7 wherein Defendants represented that they were in compliance with Alaska’s Prudent Operator  
 8 Standard), may be utilized by Plaintiffs as evidence of false or misleading statements upon which  
 9 any investor was permitted to rely.” (Order at 6-7 (footnote omitted).)

10 “[O]nly those defendants who make a false or misleading statement” or those who are  
 11 “intricate[ly] involved in the preparation of the fraudulent statements” can be held liable under  
 12 § 10(b). *In re Intern. Rectifier Corp. Sec. Litig.*, No. 07-02544, 2008 WL 4555794, at \*10 (C.D.  
 13 Cal. May 23, 2008). BPXA did not actually make a statement here because it did not file the  
 14 contract at issue. Although the Trust’s filing of the contract with the SEC may constitute a  
 15 representation *by the Trust* as to the existence and terms of the contract on which Trust unit  
 16 holders were entitled to rely, it does not transform the contract into an ongoing representation by  
 17 BPXA. The Trust and BPXA are arm’s-length parties. The Trust’s SEC filings are not signed or  
 18 certified by BPXA; they are signed and certified by BNY as Trustee.<sup>2</sup> Although SEC rules may  
 19  
 20  
 21

---

22 <sup>2</sup> If the Court wishes to view a copy of one of the Trust’s actual SEC filings during the relevant time  
 23 period, the Trust’s 2005 Form 10-K is available on-line at  
<http://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/850033/000095015205002813/113059ae10vk.htm>. BPXA  
 24 is attaching a courtesy copy of the Form 10-K as Exhibit A to the Declaration of Diane L. McGimsey.  
 25  
 26

DEFENDANT BPXA’S MOTION  
 FOR INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL  
 PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1292(B) -- 6

No. C08-1008 MJP

**GRAHAM & DUNN PC**  
 PIER 70, 2801 ALASKAN WAY ~ SUITE 300  
 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98121-1128  
 (206) 624-8300/Fax: (206) 340-9599

1 have required the Trust to file the contract as an attachment to its quarterly and annual reports,  
 2 BP p.l.c. was under no similar obligation.<sup>3</sup>

3 BPXA also was not involved—much less “intricately involved”—in the decision to  
 4 attach the contract to the Trust’s SEC filings. BPXA is contractually obligated to “provide to the  
 5 Trustee on a timely basis upon request such information not known or otherwise available to the  
 6 Trustee concerning the Royalty Interest . . . as shall be necessary to permit the Trustee to comply  
 7 with respect to the Trust with the reporting obligations of the Trust.” (BP Prudhoe Bay Royalty  
 8 Trust Agreement (“Trust Agreement”) § 4.05, attached to the McGimsey Decl. as Exhibit B.)<sup>4</sup>  
 9 Consistent with this obligation under the Trust Agreement, BPXA provides information to the  
 10 Trustee to enable the Trust to comply with its reporting obligations. But that does not change the  
 11 fact that neither BPXA nor BP p.l.c. speaks through the Trust’s SEC filings. BPXA did not  
 12 provide the contract at issue to the Trust for purposes of having the Trust file it with the SEC,  
 13 and BPXA did not have a role in preparing the Trust’s SEC filings other than providing certain  
 14 specified information to the Trust.

15 Although we are not aware of any other court that has addressed the specific question  
 16 here—whether a third party’s public filing of a contract can constitute an ongoing representation  
 17 of compliance by a party to the contract that did not make the contract public, much less invite  
 18 reliance on it—at least one other court has refused to extend § 10(b) liability in circumstances  
 19 analogous to those here. In *Lattanzio v. Deloitte & Touche LLP*, 476 F.3d 147 (2d Cir. 2007),  
 20 plaintiff sought to hold Deloitte & Touche, the issuer’s accountant, liable for misstatements in

---

21 <sup>3</sup> Additionally, it is questionable whether a reasonable investor would be entitled to rely on the public  
 22 disclosure of a contract, executed by the parties almost 20 years prior, as a representation that either  
 23 party is in full compliance with the contract.

24 <sup>4</sup> BPXA is also attaching a courtesy copy of the Overriding Royalty Conveyance as Exhibit C to the  
 25 McGimsey Declaration.

26 DEFENDANT BPXA’S MOTION  
 27 FOR INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL  
 PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1292(B) -- 7

No. C08-1008 MJP

**GRAHAM & DUNN PC**  
 PIER 70, 2801 ALASKAN WAY ~ SUITE 300  
 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98121-1128  
 (206) 624-8300/Fax: (206) 340-9599

1 the issuer's quarterly SEC filings. Although the filings did not attribute the statements to  
 2 Deloitte, plaintiffs argued that a federal regulation required Deloitte, as the issuer's accountant,  
 3 to review the quarterly filings and that therefore the issuer's investors would reasonably construe  
 4 Deloitte's failure to correct the misstatements "as its imprimatur." *Id.* at 154-55. In rejecting the  
 5 plaintiff's claim, the Second Circuit recognized that "a requirement that an issuer's accountant  
 6 review interim financial statements supports an understanding among the investing public that  
 7 such reviews are in fact conducted," but nonetheless held that the issuer's interim financial  
 8 statements could not be attributed to Deloitte because "[p]ublic understanding that an accountant  
 9 is at work behind the scenes does not create an exception to the requirement that an actionable  
 10 misstatement be made by the accountant." *Id.* at 155.

11 Likewise here, although Trust unit holders may understand that BPXA has provided  
 12 certain information requested by the Trustee for incorporation into the Trust's SEC filings,  
 13 unless the Trust's filings specifically attribute the information to BPXA, BPXA has not made  
 14 any actionable misstatement. *See, e.g., In re Hansen Natural Corp. Sec. Litig.*, 527 F. Supp. 2d  
 15 1142, 1152 n.3 (C.D. Cal. 2007). Stated differently, were BPXA itself to tout the existence of  
 16 the Overriding Royalty Conveyance or to certify to the Trust for incorporation into the Trust's  
 17 SEC filings that it is in ongoing compliance with the Prudent Operator Standard, it might be  
 18 possible to find an actionable misstatement by BPXA to Trust unit holders. But BPXA cannot  
 19 be deemed to have made an actionable misstatement to anyone, much less BP p.l.c. shareholders,  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25

26 DEFENDANT BPXA'S MOTION  
 27 FOR INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL  
 PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1292(B) -- 8

**GRAHAM & DUNN PC**  
 PIER 70, 2801 ALASKAN WAY ~ SUITE 300  
 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98121-1128  
 (206) 624-8300/Fax: (206) 340-9599

1 simply because BNY included a copy of the Overriding Royalty Conveyance with the Trust's  
 2 SEC filings.<sup>5</sup>

3 **2. An Admission of Negligence Is Not Sufficient to Establish a Strong  
 4 Inference of Scienter.**

5 On October 24, 2007, BPXA entered into a Plea Agreement with the United States  
 6 Department of Justice arising out of the March 2, 2006 oil spill at Prudhoe Bay. BPXA agreed to  
 7 plead guilty to a one-count information charging BPXA with a misdemeanor violation of the  
 8 Clean Water Act for the "negligent discharge of a harmful quantity of oil to a water of the United  
 9 States." (Plea Agreement at 6.) In finding that Plaintiffs have adequately alleged scienter as to  
 10 BPXA, the Order relied exclusively on excerpts from two paragraphs of the Plea Agreement.  
 11 (See Order at 12-13.) In those excerpts, the Plea Agreement states that "'BPXA knew that the  
 12 EOA OTL . . . had sediment collecting in the pipe,'" that "'BPXA was aware of sediment build  
 13 up on the EOA OTL prior to both spills,'" that "'BPXA knew that it had insufficient inspection  
 14 data on the EOA OTL,'" and that BPXA "'failed to clean the OTLs with a piece of equipment  
 15 called a maintenance (or cleaning) pig and inspect the pipe for corrosion activity with a smart  
 16 pig.'" (Id. at 13 (quoting the Plea Agreement at 10-11).) In concluding that Plaintiffs had  
 17 adequately alleged scienter based on the Plea Agreement, the Order erred in two respects.

18 First, the Order overlooks the fact that BPXA's entire plea to a misdemeanor violation  
 19 was predicated on a mental state of negligence. (Plea Agreement at 6 (listing elements of  
 20 misdemeanor violation of Clean Water Act as "(1) The defendant discharged oil from a point  
 21 source; (2) The amount of oil discharged was a quantity deemed to be harmful by federal

22 <sup>5</sup> Although the Ninth Circuit applies the more fluid "substantial participation" test with respect to third  
 23 party primary liability under §10(b), the ultimate limitations on liability are the same. *See In re  
 24 Homestore.com, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 347 F. Supp. 2d 790, 800 (C.D. Cal. 2004) (auditor must  
 25 substantially participate "in the creation, drafting, editing, or making of statements" to incur liability  
 26 under §10(b) and Rule 10b-5).

27 DEFENDANT BPXA'S MOTION  
 FOR INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL  
 PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1292(B) -- 9

**GRAHAM & DUNN PC**  
 PIER 70, 2801 ALASKAN WAY ~ SUITE 300  
 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98121-1128  
 (206) 624-8300/Fax: (206) 340-9599

1 regulation; (3) The oil was discharged into waters of the United States; and (4) The discharge  
 2 was caused by the negligence of the defendant.”).) No other authority of which we are aware has  
 3 held that a guilty plea predicated on negligence is sufficient to establish scienter for purposes of  
 4 § 10(b) liability. This fact alone should preclude the Plea Agreement, by itself, from giving rise  
 5 to the requisite strong inference of scienter.

6 Second, the Order erred in viewing the above-quoted sentences from the Plea Agreement  
 7 in isolation without considering the Plea Agreement as a whole. In determining whether a  
 8 plaintiff has adequately alleged scienter, courts must consider *all* factual allegations, including  
 9 those that are exculpatory, and compare and weigh the strength of potentially competing  
 10 inferences, including competing nonculpable inferences. *Tellabs, Inc. v. Makor Issues &*  
 11 *Rights, Ltd.*, 127 S.Ct. 2499, 2509 (2007). After this “holistic” review is completed, “the  
 12 inference of scienter must be more than merely ‘reasonable’ or ‘permissible’—it must be cogent  
 13 and compelling, thus strong in light of other explanations.” *Id.* Here, the Plea Agreement, read  
 14 as a whole, supports an inference of negligence that is equally strong as, if not stronger than, any  
 15 competing inference of deliberately recklessness or intentional misconduct.

16 BPXA admits in the Plea Agreement that it was aware of sediment buildup in the OTLs  
 17 and that it knew that it had insufficient inspection data. (Plea Agreement at 10-11.) But the Plea  
 18 Agreement also acknowledges that BPXA believed that its corrosion monitoring and cleaning  
 19 procedures were sufficient. In fact, immediately after the sentences of the Plea Agreement that  
 20 the Order quotes, the Plea Agreement states that “[t]he lines were not pigged because BPXA did  
 21 not recognize the need to pig the oil transit lines more frequently.” (*Id.* at 11.) The Plea  
 22 Agreement further recognized that (i) “BPXA believed that internal corrosion on the OTLs was a  
 23 low probability” (*id.* at 10), and (ii) “BPXA believed that [its external ultrasonic meters]—  
 24 augmented by a program of visual surveillance—would be reliable, would provide state-of-the  
 25

26 DEFENDANT BPXA’S MOTION  
 27 FOR INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL  
 PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1292(B) -- 10

**GRAHAM & DUNN PC**  
 PIER 70, 2801 ALASKAN WAY ~ SUITE 300  
 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98121-1128  
 (206) 624-8300/Fax: (206) 340-9599

1 art leak detection, would minimize false alarms, would surpass the regulatory requirements for  
 2 leak detection thresholds, and would provide a rapid response in detecting large and small leaks”  
 3 (*id.* at 12). It is for these reasons that Plea Agreement ultimately concludes that “BPXA acted  
 4 negligently [not recklessly] by failing to adequately inspect and clean the OTLs.” (*Id.* at 8.)

5 To plead scienter through allegations of recklessness, a plaintiff must do more than allege  
 6 carelessness, negligence, gross negligence or even ordinary recklessness. Rather, the Ninth  
 7 Circuit has held that a plaintiff must “plead, in great detail, facts that constitute strong  
 8 circumstantial evidence of *deliberately* reckless or conscious misconduct.” *In re Silicon*  
 9 *Graphics Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 183 F.3d 970, 974 (9th Cir. 1999) (emphasis added). BPXA’s  
 10 admission to conduct constituting the negligent discharge of oil into waters of the United States  
 11 comes nowhere close to establishing that BPXA “acted with an intent to defraud, conscious  
 12 misconduct, or deliberate recklessness.” *DSAM Global Value Fund v. Altris Software*, 288 F.3d  
 13 385, 387 (9th Cir. 2002).

14 **C. Review of the Proposed Issues May Materially Advance the Termination of  
 15 the Litigation.**

16 Closely related to the “controlling question” prong of § 1292(b) is whether immediate  
 17 appellate review of an interlocutory order “may materially advance the ultimate termination of  
 18 the litigation.” *In re Cement Antitrust Litig.*, 673 F.2d at 1026. In considering this prong of  
 19 § 1292(b), reversal by the appellate court should be assumed. *Id.* Here, there can be no serious  
 20 dispute that an immediate appeal “may materially advance the ultimate termination of the  
 21 litigation.” If the Ninth Circuit were to disagree with the Court’s ruling on either issue, this  
 22 litigation would be terminated. In a case where Plaintiffs’ counsel has suggested possible  
 23 damages in the billions of dollars and where the parties undoubtedly will have to spend millions

24  
 25  
 26 DEFENDANT BPXA’S MOTION  
 27 FOR INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL  
 PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1292(B) -- 11

**GRAHAM & DUNN PC**  
 PIER 70, 2801 ALASKAN WAY ~ SUITE 300  
 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98121-1128  
 (206) 624-8300/Fax: (206) 340-9599

1 of dollars in discovery and experts before the case is ready for trial, interlocutory appellate  
2 review of these threshold issues is even more appropriate.

3 **III. CONCLUSION**

4 For the foregoing reasons, Defendant BPXA respectfully requests that the Court certify  
5 the Order for interlocutory appeal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b).

6 DATED this 3rd day of April, 2009.

7 **GRAHAM & DUNN PC**

8 By /s/ David C. Lundsgaard  
9 David C. Lundsgaard, WSBA #25448  
10 2801 Alaskan Way, Suite 300  
11 Seattle, WA 98121-1128  
12 Email: dlundsgaard@grahamdunn.com

13 *Attorneys for Defendants*

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 DEFENDANT BPXA'S MOTION  
27 FOR INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL  
PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1292(B) -- 12

**GRAHAM & DUNN PC**  
PIER 70, 2801 ALASKAN WAY ~ SUITE 300  
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98121-1128  
(206) 624-8300/Fax: (206) 340-9599

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on April 3, 2009, I electronically filed (1) Defendant BPXA's Motion For Interlocutory Appeal Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(B) and (2) Declaration of Diane L. McGimsey in Support of Motion to Certify Order of February 27, 2009 for Interlocutory Appeal (with Exhibits) with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the following:

Thomas A. Dubbs	<a href="mailto:tdubbs@labaton.com">tdubbs@labaton.com</a>
Alan I. Ellman	<a href="mailto:aellman@labaton.com">aellman@labaton.com</a>
Javier Bleichmar	<a href="mailto:jbleichmar@labaton.com">jbleichmar@labaton.com</a>
Jonathan Gardner	<a href="mailto:jgardner@labaton.com">jgardner@labaton.com</a>
Peter A. Binkow	<a href="mailto:pbinkow@glancylaw.com">pbinkow@glancylaw.com</a>
Neal A. Dublinsky	<a href="mailto:ndublinsky@glancylaw.com">ndublinsky@glancylaw.com</a>
William F. Salle	<a href="mailto:wfslaw@yahoo.com">wfslaw@yahoo.com</a>
Robert D. Stewart	<a href="mailto:stewart@kiplinglawgroup.com">stewart@kiplinglawgroup.com</a>
Timothy M. Moran	<a href="mailto:moran@kiplinglawgroup.com">moran@kiplinglawgroup.com</a>
Richard C. Pepperman, II	<a href="mailto:peppermanr@sullcrom.com">peppermanr@sullcrom.com</a>
Steven J. Purcell	<a href="mailto:purcells@sullcrom.com">purcells@sullcrom.com</a>
John L. Warden	<a href="mailto:wardenj@sullcrom.com">wardenj@sullcrom.com</a>
Elizabeth Kayla Ehrlich	<a href="mailto:ehrlich@sullcrom.com">ehrlich@sullcrom.com</a>
Gerald L. Black, Jr.	<a href="mailto:blackg@sullcrom.com">blackg@sullcrom.com</a>
Diane L. McGimsey	<a href="mailto:mcgimseyd@sullcrom.com">mcgimseyd@sullcrom.com</a>

Dated: April 3, 2009

# GRAHAM & DUNN PC

By /s/ David C. Lundsgaard

David C. Lundsgaard

WSBA# 25448

Email: dlundsgaard@grahamdunn.com

## Attorneys for Defendants

DEFENDANT BPXA'S MOTION  
FOR INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL  
PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1292(B) -- 13

**GRAHAM & DUNN PC**  
PIER 70, 2801 ALASKAN WAY ~ SUITE 300  
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98121-1128  
(206) 624-8300/Fax: (206) 340-9599